

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 28-29 and 37-38 have been amended. Claims 28-34 and 36-42 are pending.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 28, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,586,338 issued to Lynch in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,038 issued to Barber.

Claim 28 recites the following:

reading a first system identification number ("SID") broadcast in a first frequency band, said first SID identifying a particular cellular service provider;  
determining whether said first SID matches a SID stored in a SID table;  
switching to a second frequency band and reading a second SID broadcast in said second frequency band if said first SID does not match a SID stored in said SID table, wherein said particular cellular service is identified if said first or second SID matches a SID stored in said SID table;  
determining whether a low-priority detection process is sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support if neither said first nor said second SID are identified in said SID table;  
performing the low-priority detection process if the low-priority detection process is determined to be sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support; and  
performing a high priority detection process for detecting said particular cellular service support if the low-priority detection process is determined to be insufficient.

Claim 37 recites similar limitations.

Neither Lynch nor Barber discloses determining whether a low-priority detection process is sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support if neither said first nor said second SID are identified in said SID table, performing the low-priority detection process if the low-priority detection process is determined to be sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support, and performing a high priority detection process for detecting said particular

cellular service support if the low-priority detection process is determined to be insufficient.

These limitations are recited in claims 28, 36, and 37. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28, 36, and 37 are patentable over Lynch and Barber.

Claims 29, 30, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch and Barber in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,060 issued to Evans and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,265 issued to Roach.

As discussed above, neither Lynch nor Barber discloses determining whether a low-priority detection process is sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support if neither said first nor said second SID are identified in said SID table, performing the low-priority detection process if the low-priority detection process is determined to be sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support, and performing a high priority detection process for detecting said particular cellular service support if the low-priority detection process is determined to be insufficient. These limitations are recited in claims 29, 30, and 38.

The Office Action states that Evans discloses that a control message is referred to as a page and SID is carried in the control channel and that Roach discloses identifying the SID by a NPA. Whether or not Evans and Roach disclose these features, neither Evans nor Roach discloses determining whether a low-priority detection process is sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support if neither said first nor said second SID are identified in said SID table, performing the low-priority detection process if the low-priority detection process is determined to be sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support, and performing a high priority detection process for detecting said particular cellular service support if the low-priority detection process is determined to be insufficient. Thus, neither Evans nor Roach cures the deficiencies of Lynch and Barber. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 29, 30, and 38 are patentable over Lynch, Barber, Evans, and Roach.

Claims 31-34 and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynch and Barber in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,159,625 issued to Zicker and further in view of Evans.

As discussed above, neither Lynch nor Barber nor Evans discloses determining whether a low-priority detection process is sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support if neither said first nor said second SID are identified in said SID table, performing the low-priority detection process if the low-priority detection process is determined to be sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support, and performing a high priority detection process for detecting said particular cellular service support if the low-priority detection process is determined to be insufficient. These limitations are recited in claims 31-34 and 39-42.

The Office Action states that Zicker teaches the exchange of data between host and a remotely programmable cellular mobile radiotelephone. Whether or not Zicker discloses this feature, Zicker does not disclose determining whether a low-priority detection process is sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support if neither said first nor said second SID are identified in said SID table, performing the low-priority detection process if the low-priority detection process is determined to be sufficient for detecting said particular cellular service support, and performing a high priority detection process for detecting said particular cellular service support if the low-priority detection process is determined to be insufficient. Thus, Zicker does not cure the deficiencies of Lynch, Barber, and Evans. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 31-34 and 39-42 are patentable over Lynch, Barber, Zicker, and Evans.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 28-34 and 36-42 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: 3/8/04

Lisa Tom  
Lisa Tom  
Reg. No. 52,291

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

3/8/04  
Date of Deposit  
Annie Pearson  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence  
Annie Pearson 3/8/04  
Signature Date